

REMARKS

Enclosed is a new declaration for this application.

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The claims have been amended above to overcome the rejection.

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergan (US 2,724,098). The examiner is requested to reconsider this rejection.

The examiner used the term "PHOSITA" in the office action. It is assumed the examiner intended to use the term "person having ordinary skill in the art". If this is incorrect, the examiner is requested to clarify.

Claim 1 claims a method comprising successive steps of compression-necking a barrel onto a cable by a die stamping operation, and then a punching operation to form indentations after the die stamping operation.

The examiner stated that in Bergan it would have been obvious to punch the indent (27) into the barrel subsequent to the compression-necking after the stamping step. The examiner considered it within the ordinary skill of a person having ordinary skill in the art to punch the barrel subsequent to the compression necking step given Bergan's teaching. The examiner has made an error.

Bergan teaches at column 1, lines 30-37 that a problem in the prior art was that pull-apart tension for a two-part connector (having a tongue and a sleeve) could pull the tongue out of

the sleeve. Thus, Bergan teaches that a "primary object" of the invention was to provide a two-part connector complete as an article of manufacture before it is crimped onto the conductor core "n" and, thus, which can be manufactured with the parts permanently connected under factory conditions. From this description it is clear that Bergan teaches manufacturing the connector shown in Fig. 6 with the two parts 10, 11 permanently connected under factory conditions before being installed onto a conductor. Please note that "k" in Figs. 4 and 5 is a connector assembly mandrel used to assembly the connector shown in Fig. 6; not the conductor core "n" which the connector assembly 10, 11 is subsequently crimped onto.

Thus, Bergan **teaches away** from forming the crimp 27 before the two parts 10, 11 are connected to each other. The examiner statement that it would be obvious to punch the barrel subsequent to the compression necking step goes against the teaching of Bergan. In view of the explicit teaching in Bergan, that it is desired to stamp the two parts 10, 11 together before the two parts are subsequently crimped onto the conductor core "n" by indent 27, the examiner is requested to reconsider his rejection.

Claim 1 claims compression-necking a barrel **onto a cable** by a die stamping operation, and then a punching operation to form indentations after the die stamping operation, wherein the punching operation is performed **after** the die stamping operation. This is not suggested by Bergan. In Bergan, the sleeve 10 is compressed by the dies a, b onto the tongue 11, but not onto the cable m, n by the dies a, b. Thus, the

compression of the sleeve 10 onto the tongue 11 by the dies 10, 11 cannot be considered the same as applicants' claimed compression-necking a barrel **onto a cable** by a die stamping operation as recited in claim 1.

The features of claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested in the cited art. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable and should be allowed.

Though the claims dependent upon claim 1 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 1. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Claim 15 claims a crimping tool comprising a die in two parts, which define a stamp in an interior, means for moving the two parts of the die relative to each other, at least one punch for making indentations in the barrel, and means for moving said punch. The means for moving the punch is linked to the means for moving the two parts of the die in such a way that, during a crimping operation, the punch is configured to be moved from a retracted position, in which the punch is disengaged from the stamp of the die, to an active position, in which the punch projects into the interior of the stamp after the die is closed.

Nowhere in Bergan is such a tool disclosed or suggested. Bergan merely discloses an electrical connector assembly 10, 11. Dies a, b permanently connected the two parts 10, 11 to each other before the assembly 10, 11 is connected to the conductor n with the indent 27. However, there is no

disclosure or suggestion of the tool which makes the indent 27 being part of the dies a, b. The features of claim 15 are not disclosed or suggested in the cited art. Therefore, claim 15 is patentable and should be allowed.

Though the claims dependent upon claim 15 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 15. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain, the examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington 7/1/08
Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686) Date

Customer No.: 29683
Harrington & Smith, PC
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
203-925-9400

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail on the date shown below in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

7/1/2008 Clair J. Man
Date Name of Person Making Deposit